DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 290 HE 019 730

AUTHOR Cahalan, Margaret; And Others
TITLE College Level Remediation. Fast Response Survey System Report No. 19.
INSTITUTION Westat Research, Inc., Rockville, Md.
SPONS AGENCY Center for Statistics (OERI/ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO CS-86-218; FRSS-R-19
PUB DATE Oct 86
CONTRACT 300-85-0133
NOTE 31p.; Survey questionnaire may not reproduce well due to small print size.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Special Services Division, Publications Branch, 80 F Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20208.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; Basic Skills; *College Freshmen; *College Programs; Credit Courses; *Developmental Studies Programs; Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; High Risk Students; Institutional Characteristics; *National Surveys; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Programs; Remedial Reading; Writing Instruction

ABSTRACT

Findings of a national survey of remedial studies in two- and four-year colleges are presented. Data were reported for the 1983-1984 academic year. The study focused on providing estimates of the: number and type of remedial courses offered; percent of freshmen needing and taking courses; changes in enrollment; program characteristics such as type of credit and requirement status; and program outcome as measured by course completion, retention, and self-evaluation. Remedial studies were defined as any program, course, or other activity for students lacking the necessary skills to perform college-level work required by the institution. Data are presented in the following categories: all institutions, and institutions classified by type (two-year, four-year), control (public, private), admission criteria, geographic region, size, and minority status. Estimates are weighted to produce national estimates. Estimates of percent of students needing, enrolled in, and completing remedial courses, and percent of student retained, are weighted by total first year enrollment. All other estimates are per school not per student. Appendices provide information on the Fast Response Survey System of the National Center for Education Statistics, the survey methodology, and standard errors of statistics. The questionnaire is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED274290

College Level Remediation

OERI
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
Center for Statistics

FRSS Report No. 19

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHLIGHTS

- Four out of five colleges and universities offered at least one remedial course in 1983-84. Seventy-three percent offered writing, 71 percent mathematics, and 66 percent reading.
- Remedial courses were offered in 88 percent or more of the public, 2-year, and open admission colleges, and in about 70 percent of the private, 4-year, and selective admission colleges.
- About 25 percent of all college freshmen took remedial mathematics in 1983-84; 21 percent took writing, and 16 percent took reading.
- On the average, colleges provided two different courses in a given remedial subject.
- Sixty-three percent of colleges having remedial courses reported increases in remedial enrollment of at least 10 percent since 1978. Only 4 percent indicated a decline, while 33 percent reported no change.
- About 33 percent of colleges had a separate remedial department or division; 90 percent offered support services, such as tutoring and counseling; and 22 percent provided pre-admission summer remedial programs.
- Most colleges did not award degree credit for remedial courses. About half awarded institutional credit, which counted in determining full-time status, but did not count toward degree completion. Almost 20 percent awarded no credit at all.
- Remedial courses were mandatory for students not meeting institutional standards in 64 percent of colleges offering remedial writing, 59 percent offering remedial mathematics, and 51 percent offering remedial reading.
- College administrators responsible for remedial programs rated most aspects of the program as moderately successful.
- Remedial courses were successfully completed by an average of about 74 percent of those taking remedial reading, 71 percent taking writing, and 68 percent taking mathematics.
- Overall, 61 percent of all freshmen were retained to the second year, compared with 55 percent of freshmen taking one or more remedial courses.

(Based on responses from a nationally representative sample of institutions of higher education weighted to national estimates. Data were reported for the 1983-84 academic year.)

College Level Remediation

FRSS Report No. 19

Project Officer:
Douglas A. Wright

By:
Margaret Cahalan
Elizabeth Farris
Westat, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education
William J. Bennett
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Chester E. Finn, Jr.
Assistant Secretary

Center for Statistics
Emerson J. Elliott
Director

Information Services
James J. Bencivenga
Director

Center for Statistics

"The purpose of the Center shall be to collect and disseminate statistics and other data related to education in the United States and in other nations. The Center shall . . . collect, collate, and, from time to time, report full and complete statistics on the conditions of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports on specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; . . . and review and report on education activities in foreign countries."--Section 406(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1).

This report was prepared for the Center for Statistics by Westat, Inc. under Contract Number 300-85-0133

Recent reports of the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS):

No. 18-- Teacher Preparation in the Use of Computers, 1986

No. 20-- Patron Use of Computers in Public Libraries, 1986

No. 21-- Discipline in Public Secondary Schools, 1986 School Discipline Policies and Practices, 1986

No. 22-- Adult Literacy Programs: Services, Persons Served and Volunteers, 1986

No. 23-- Public High School Graduation Requirements, 1986

FOREWORD

This report presents the findings of a national survey of remedial studies in 2-year and 4-year colleges. The survey was requested by the former Under Secretary of Education, Gary Jones. The request grew out of concerns expressed by many, including the National Commission on Excellence in Education, regarding deficiencies in basic skills of many college-bound high school graduates. The survey was intended to provide an overview of the extent of remediation and characteristics of remedial programs.

The survey was conducted in 1984 by the Center for Statistics (CS), through its Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). FRSS was established to collect small amounts of policy-oriented data quickly and with minimum burden on respondents.

Some findings of this survey were disseminated to the public in bulletin form in September 1985. This report, the 19th in the FRSS series, will be useful to education officials as well as to organizations and individuals concerned with higher education.

Emerson J. Elliott
Director

October 1986

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This survey was designed to obtain a national picture of remedial instruction at the college level. Background information and advice on questionnaire content and format were received from various Department of Education and higher education officials. In addition, the survey was coordinated with the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), under the direction of John Wittstruck, Director of the SHEEO/CS Network.

A number of the staff of the Center for Statistics contributed to this survey, especially Robert Thomas. The survey was conducted by Westat, a research firm in Rockville, Maryland, under contract to the Center. The Westat project team included Patricia Cruz, Frances Cohen, Kristine White, Lisa Kammerman, and David Marker. The authors also acknowledge with gratitude the assistance of the survey respondents, who voluntarily provided the data.

CONTENTS

	Page
HIGHLIGHTS	Inside Front Cover
FOREWORD	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
SURVEY FINDINGS	3
Course Offerings	3
Remedial Course Enrollment	3
Selected Characteristics of Remedial Programs	4
Type of Credit and Requirement Status	4
Need for Remediation Compared with Remedial Enrollment	5
Program Self-Evaluation	6
Course Completion and Retention Data	6
APPENDIXES:	
I. The Fast Response Survey System	19
Methodology for the Survey of Remedial/Developmental Studies in Institutions of Higher Education	19
Standard Errors of Statistics	20
II. Reproduction of Survey Questionnaire	Inside Back Cover

CONTENTS--Continued

TEXT TABLES

Page

1.--Institutions of higher education offering remedial courses, and average number of courses offered in remedial reading, writing, and math, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 7

2.--Change in enrollment since 1978, and percent of freshmen enrolled in remedial reading, writing, and math courses, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 8

3.--Students enrolled in remedial reading, writing, and math courses, and percent of freshmen remedial course hours, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 9

4.--Institutions of higher education with remedial/developmental resources, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 10

5a.-Percent of institutions with certain credit offerings and requirement status for remedial courses in reading, writing, and math, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84 11

5b.-Percent of institutions with certain credit offerings and requirement status for remedial courses in reading, writing, and math, by size, region, and minority status: United States, 1983-84 12

6.--Percent of freshmen needing and enrolled in remedial reading, writing, and math courses in schools having remedial courses, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 13

7a.-Average ratings of remedial program aspects and services, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84 14

7b.-Average ratings of remedial program aspects and services, by size, region, and minority status: United States, 1983-84 15

8.--Percent of students completing remedial courses, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 16

9.--Percent of schools keeping records of retention to the second year, and percent of all freshmen and freshmen taking one or more remedial courses retained to the second year, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 17

10.-Percent of freshmen taking one or more remedial courses and all freshmen retained to the second year, by remedial course status and by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84 18

APPENDIX TABLE

Standard errors of selected items 21

INTRODUCTION

Remedial education, one of the fastest growing areas of the college curriculum during the 1970's,[1] has not been without controversy. Debates have occurred in the education community, State legislatures, and the press about why remedial instruction should be necessary at the college level. And, if such instruction is necessary, where should it take place within the higher education system.[2] Concerns about providing equal opportunity and achieving higher levels of education for all citizens have been weighed against interests in maintaining high standards and curtailing cost of services. As noted by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), these goals need not be mutually exclusive:

> We do not believe that a public commitment to educational reform must be at the expense of a strong public commitment to equitable treatment of our diverse population. Our goal must be to develop the talents of all to their fullest. Attaining that goal requires that we expect and assist all students to work to the limits of their capabilities.[3]

The need for remediation in colleges and universities is not a new phenomenon. A review of the history of college-level remediation illustrates that the inadequate preparation of college-bound freshmen has been a recurring problem. In the late 19th century, preparatory programs operated by the universities themselves served a similar purpose. In 1894, preparatory students composed over 40 percent of entering students in American colleges.[4] Preparatory programs were considered pre-college, although it was not uncommon for college credit to be given. From 1920 until the late 1960's, college preparation and remediation were tasks generally assigned to 2-year colleges.

By 1970 a number of factors, such as a change in enrollment patterns of entering freshmen, a decline in high school achievement levels, and a transition to open admissions on the part of many colleges resulted in a new focus on remediation. These changes occurred at the same time the technological demands of the work place were increasing: "These phenomena collided, and remedial courses, support activities and services quietly appeared on campuses."[5]

The FRSS remedial study grew out of concerns expressed by the NCEE and others concerning the problem of students' inadequate preparation for college and the ongoing debate over the appropriateness of college-level remediation. The objective of the study was to provide reliable national estimates of the extent and characteristics of remedial programs which could be used by policy-makers and practitioners responsible for decision-making in this

---

[1] Jack Magarrell, "Colleges Offer 15 Percent More Courses This Year," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 50(2) (June 1, 1981): 1-8.

[2] Illinois State Board of Higher Education, "Status Report of Remediation in Higher Education," Springfield, June 1981. An example of the result of the debate over remediation in State legislatures is the 1977 Illinois State legislature resolution calling for the reduction of remedial courses at the university level and concentration of necessary courses at the community college level by 1983. The resolution also prohibited granting degree credit for remedial courses.

[3] U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983: 13.

[4] Arthur Levine, Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978, as cited in California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep, Remedial Education in California's Colleges and Universities. Sacramento, California, 1983.

[5] California Postsecondary Education Commision, p. 8.

area. Specifically, the study focused on providing estimates of the:

- Number and type of remedial courses offered;
- Percent of freshmen needing and taking courses;
- Changes in enrollment;
- Program characteristics such as type of credit and requirement status; and
- Program outcome as measured by course completion, retention, and self-evaluation.

The definition of remedial studies used in the survey encompassed any program, course, or other activity for students lacking the necessary skills to perform college-level work required by the institution. Throughout the questionnaire these activities were referred to as "remedial/developmental." However, respondents were asked to answer for any activity meeting the definition, regardless of name. Colleges used a variety of names such as *compensatory*, *basic skills*, and *preparatory*, all of which met the definition for remedial studies.

The extent of college-level remediation is a function of many variables including: the adequacy of high school preparation, student choice of college, level of college entrance standards, rigor of entry level courses, and availability of remedial courses. The identification of students lacking skills necessary to perform college-level work is a function of the standards of the institution and not a uniform standard. What is considered remedial in one institution may not be so identified in another.

The estimates in this report are based on sample data and have been weighted to produce national estimates. Data are presented in the following categories: all institutions, and institutions classified by type (2-year, 4-year), control (public, private), admission criteria, geographic region, size, and minority status.[6] Estimates of percent of students needing, enrolled in, and completing remedial courses, and percent of students retained have been weighted by total first year enrollment. All other estimates are per school not per student. The methodology and sampling error are discussed in appendix I. The survey questionnaire is presented in appendix II (inside back cover).

---

[6]Colleges were classified based on the selectivity of their admission criteria according to the Chronicle Two-Year College Databook and Chronicle Four-Year College Databook, 1984, published by Chronicle Guidance Publications, Inc., Moravia, New York. The classifications are defined by the Chronicle Databook as follows: open colleges accept all high school graduates; liberal colleges accept some students from the lower half of the high school class; traditional colleges accept all students from the top half of the class; and selective colleges prefer students in the top quarter of the class. Minority colleges were those in which the largest single group in the total student body consisted of Black, Hispanic, or American Indian or Alaskan native students.

SURVEY FINDINGS

Course Offerings

Most U.S. colleges and universities provided basic skills remediation as part of their curricula. In 1983-84, 82 percent of colleges offered at least one remedial course in reading, writing, or mathematics (table 1). Slightly more colleges offered remedial courses in writing and mathematics (73 and 71 percent) than in reading (66 percent).

Remedial course offerings in colleges varied by the following institutional characteristics: control, size, admission criteria, minority status, and type. Specifically, offering at least one remedial course was more common in:

- Public colleges (94 percent) than in private colleges (70 percent);
- Large colleges (more than 5,000 students) (94 percent) than in small colleges (fewer than 1,000 students) (69 percent);
- Open admission colleges (91 percent) than in selective colleges (68 percent);
- Minority colleges (91 percent) than in non-minority colleges (81 percent); and
- Two-year colleges (88 percent) than in 4-year colleges (78 percent).

In general, these patterns held for remedial course offerings in reading, writing, and mathematics. However, no significant differences were found for remedial course offerings in writing and mathematics in minority and non-minority colleges.

Colleges with remedial courses typically offered one or two separate courses in each subject. For example, 54 percent had one remedial reading course, 25 percent had two, 15 percent had three or four, and only 5 percent had more than four. The pattern was similar for remedial writing and mathematics courses (not shown in tables). The average number of courses for a subject was about two (table 1). Colleges in which remedial courses were more frequently available also offered slightly more courses. Large, public, open admission, and 2-year colleges averaged about one more course in each subject than did small, private, selective, and 4-year colleges.

Remedial Course Enrollment

In 1983-84, one out of every four freshmen enrolled in a remedial mathematics course (table 2). Almost as many took a remedial writing course (21 percent), and 16 percent took remedial reading as part of their college courseloads.[7]

The types of colleges more likely to offer at least one remedial course generally reported higher remedial enrollments. For example, the following enrollment differences occurred in remedial mathematics courses:

- 27 percent of all freshmen in public colleges and 15 percent in private colleges;
- 28 percent in 2-year colleges and 19 percent in 4-year colleges;
- 30 percent in open admission colleges and 13 percent in selective colleges;
- 25 percent in large colleges and 19 percent in small colleges; and
- 45 percent in minority colleges and 24 percent in non-minority colleges.

The enrollment patterns for remedial reading and writing were similar to that for remedial mathematics with one exception--enrollments in remedial reading were about the same in small colleges (14 percent) and large colleges (16 percent).

Sixty-three percent of college officials reported an increase in remedial enrollment since 1978: 44 percent reported enrollment increases between 10 and 30 percent; 9 percent reported increases of 31 to 50 percent; and 10 percent reported increases of more than 50 percent (not shown in tables). Only 4

---

[7] The survey did not obtain data on the number of students taking remedial courses in one subject who also took remedial courses in at least one other subject.

percent said that remedial enrollment in their colleges had dropped 10 percent or more between 1978 and 1984, and 33 percent said that remedial enrollment had remained about the same (table 2).

Colleges that provided greater access to remedial courses reported increases in remedial enrollment more frequently than colleges where remediation was less readily available. Almost three-fourths of open admission colleges had an increase of 10 percent or more in remedial enrollment, while only half of selective colleges reported increases. Similarly, enrollment increased in about 70 percent of public colleges and 2-year colleges, compared with 54 percent of private colleges and 58 percent of 4-year colleges. However, remedial enrollment increased relatively more often in non-minority colleges (64 percent) than in minority colleges (48 percent).

Table 3 shows the distribution of all freshmen and remedial freshmen by types of colleges. These figures further demonstrate the predominant role in college-level remediation played by public, 2-year, and open admission colleges. For example, 85 percent of all freshmen and 91 percent of freshmen taking remedial courses were enrolled in public colleges. In contrast, 15 percent of all freshmen and about 9 percent of freshmen taking remedial courses were enrolled in private colleges. Similarly, almost three-fourths of freshmen taking remedial courses attended 2-year and open admission colleges.

Students taking remedial courses generally took nonremedial courses as well. Although 16 to 25 percent of freshmen took remedial reading, writing, or mathematics in 1983-84, remedial coursework was only 5 percent of the total freshman courseload (table 3).[8] In public, 2-year, open admission, and minority colleges, remediation was between 6 and 13 percent of the freshman courseload; the corresponding percents for private, 4-year, selective, and non-minority colleges ranged from 3 to 5 percent.

[8]This figure was estimated from the sum of reported total hours taken in remedial reading, writing, and mathematics as a percent of the total number of first year, FTE students multiplied by 30 hours (assumed FTE hours).

Selected Characteristics of Remedial Programs

Most colleges (90 percent) offered remedial support services such as diagnosis, learning assistance labs, tutoring, and counseling. Overall, 33 percent of colleges had separate remedial departments or divisions. Departments were more often found in public (47 percent), 2-year (43 percent), large (42 percent), open admission (45 percent), and minority (48 percent) colleges and universities (table 4).

About one-fourth of the colleges provided a special, pre-admission summer program. Colleges offering such a program had an average freshman enrollment of 8 percent (not shown in tables). Unlike regular remedial courses, pre-admission summer programs were more available at 4-year, traditional, and selective colleges than at 2-year and open admission colleges. About one-third of traditional and selective colleges provided such programs.

While the most frequently offered remedial courses were in reading, writing, and mathematics, 58 percent of the colleges offered remedial courses in student development (e.g., career planning, decisionmaking, and study skills). About 20 percent provided remedial courses in academic areas other than reading, writing, or mathematics (table 4). Colleges offering these alternatives averaged about three additional remedial courses [2.9 for student development and 2.8 for other academic subjects (not shown in tables)].

Type of Credit and Requirement Status

A much-discussed issue in planning remedial programs is college credit. Some educators maintain that remedial courses given for credit are more successful because student motivation is increased.[9] Other educators view granting credit as lowering college standards.

[9]Roueche, John; Baker, George; Roueche, Suanne, College Responses to Low Achieving Students: A National Study. Orlando, Florida: HBJ Media Systems Corporation, 1984.

Research done in preparation for the survey identified four policies regarding credit for remedial courses:

- No formal credit;
- Institutional credit (non-degree);
- Degree credit, elective only; and
- Degree credit, fulfilling subject requirements.

The concept of institutional credit was developed in response to the view (and, in some cases, the demand of students paying for the courses) that some type of credit should be given. Institutional credit counted in determining full-time student status for student loans and other college status purposes and became part of a student's permanent college record, but did not count toward degree completion.

In 1983-84 only about 30 percent of colleges awarded degree credit (subject or elective) for any remedial courses (table 5a); less than 7 percent gave degree credit which also fulfilled the subject requirement. Instead, institutional credit was the most frequent type of credit, with slightly more than half of all colleges awarding this credit for remedial reading, writing, and mathematics courses. Using writing as an example, 53 percent of colleges awarded institutional credit, 25 percent elective degree credit, 6 percent subject degree credit, and 16 percent awarded no formal credit.

Regional differences were apparent in the response to the question of what type of credit, if any, should be awarded. About 35 percent of colleges in the North Atlantic region did not give formal credit for remedial reading, writing, or mathematics. Colleges in the other regions not giving credit ranged from 5 to 19 percent.

A related question was whether remedial courses should be mandatory or voluntary. In the majority of colleges offering remedial courses, students not meeting certain institutional standards were required to take the courses: 64 percent of colleges required remedial writing, 59 percent remedial mathematics, and 51 percent remedial reading. Proportionately more private colleges and 4-year colleges required remedial courses than public colleges and 2-year colleges (table 5a). Remedial courses were more likely to be mandatory in small colleges rather than large colleges, and in colleges in the North Atlantic and Southeast (table 5b).

Need for Remediation Compared with Remedial Enrollment

Colleges having at least one course in the subject reported that an average of 37 percent of entering students needed remedial mathematics, 29 percent remedial reading, and 31 percent remedial writing. These percentages were consistent with estimates from other studies on the need for remediation.[10]

Table 6 compares the percent of freshmen needing remedial courses with the percent enrolled in these courses. Nationally about 8 to 10 percent more students needed remedial courses than were actually taking these courses.[11] Public, 2-year, and open admission colleges had larger differences between estimated need and enrollment than did private, 4-year, and selective colleges. Minority colleges reported the highest need for remedial courses, but differences between need and enrollment were similar to the national average.

---

[10] A 1981 national study of colleges and universities conducted by the Instructional Resource Center of CUNY found that 32 percent of freshmen were estimated to need remedial mathematics, 31 percent remedial writing, and 28 percent remedial reading; "Assessment and Improvement of Academic Skills of Entering Freshment Students: A National Survey," New York, September 1983. This report also provides extensive information on placement/assessment procedures of responding colleges.

[11] These results indicate that there may be an unmet need for remediation in about an additional 10 percent of freshmen. The questionnaires did not ask colleges not offering courses to estimate need. Inclusion of these colleges (about 18 percent) may have resulted in somewhat lower estimates of the overall need, but larger differences between enrollment and estimated need.

Program Self-Evaluation

Colleges with remedial programs were asked to evaluate several aspects of their programs on a scale of 1 to 5. A rating of 1 was a low evaluation and a rating of 5 was a high evaluation. Ratings were in four areas: courses, support services, organization and policy, and outcome for remedial students. Most rated their programs moderately high, with an overall average rating of 3.8. Highest ratings (average of 4 or higher) were given to teacher attitude, teacher training, and curriculum content and structure (table 7). Lowest ratings were given to program evaluation, degree completion rate, and breadth of course offerings; 30 percent of respondents rated program evaluation below average (1 or 2), and 19 percent rated degree completion below average (not shown in tables).

Course Completion and Retention Data

For further measures of remedial program outcomes, college administrators were asked about remedial course completion and student retention to the second year. Completion rates for remedial courses ranged from 68 percent for mathematics to 74 percent for reading (table 8). Private, traditional, and selective colleges had somewhat higher completion rates.

The success of a remedial program is determined not only by remedial course completion, but by the extent students taking remedial courses are able to complete non-remedial subjects and obtain a degree or certificate. However, past research suggests that retention and degree data are difficult to obtain. To simplify the task, retention was defined as "retained to the start of the second year of college." In addition, respondents were asked if their colleges kept retention records for all freshmen and for freshmen taking remedial courses. If records were kept, respondents reported retention data from the records; if records were not kept, respondents estimated retention rates.

While 63 percent of colleges kept records on the percent of all freshmen retained to the second year, only 35 percent kept separate records on students taking remedial courses (table 9). Retention records were kept more frequently by 4-year than 2-year colleges. Since 2-year colleges had a larger population of part-time students, retention information was difficult to collect and interpret.

Record-based retention rates tended to be consistently higher than estimated rates: 64 percent compared with 57 percent for all freshmen, and 60 percent compared with 52 percent for freshmen taking remedial courses (table 9). Data from the two sources have been combined in table 10.

Nationwide, 61 percent of all freshmen were retained to the second year (table 10). Colleges without remedial courses (18 percent) had somewhat higher average retention rates (71 percent). Perhaps colleges having higher rates had less need for remediation and, hence, were less likely to initiate courses. Private, 4-year, and selective colleges were represented more frequently among those colleges not having remedial courses. For example, 83 percent of colleges without remedial courses were private compared with 49 percent overall (not shown in tables).

The percent of all freshmen retained to the second year was slightly higher than the percent for freshmen taking one remedial course or more. In colleges with remedial courses, 60 percent of all freshmen were retained, compared with 55 percent of freshmen taking remedial courses.

Table 1.--Institutions of higher education offering remedial courses, and average number of courses offered in remedial reading, writing, and math, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84

Institutional characteristic	Institutions					Average number of courses offered		
	Number with freshmen	Percent offering one or more remedial courses						
		Reading, writing, or math	Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing	Math
All institutions	2,785	82	66	73	71	1.9	1.8	2.0
Control								
Public	1,419	94	87	89	88	2.2	2.1	2.5
Private	1,366	70	44	56	53	1.3	1.3	1.3
Type of institution								
2-year	1,295	88	80	78	82	2.2	2.2	2.5
4-year	1,490	78	53	69	61	1.5	1.4	1.5
Admission criteria								
Open	1,258	91	87	83	85	2.2	2.1	2.5
Liberal	714	72	54	61	64	1.5	1.5	1.5
Traditional	354	80	52	75	65	1.4	1.3	1.4
Selective	459	68	37	62	48	1.5	1.5	1.6
Region								
North Atlantic	773	76	54	67	61	1.6	1.6	1.8
Great Lakes and Plains	730	87	71	71	75	1.7	1.6	1.9
Southeast	684	86	73	79	73	2.1	1.7	2.0
West and Southwest	599	82	64	77	76	2.4	2.4	2.4
Size								
Less than 1,000	849	69	46	55	50	1.2	1.2	1.4
1,000 to 5,000	1,212	84	69	78	76	2.1	1.8	2.1
Greater than 5,000	724	94	83	86	87	2.2	2.3	2.4
Minority status								
Minority	196	91	91	72	78	2.0	1.9	2.0
Non-minority	2,589	81	64	73	70	1.9	1.8	2.0

Table 2.--Change in enrollment since 1978, and percent of freshmen enrolled in remedial reading, writing, and math courses, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84

Institutional characteristic	Enrollment change since 1978				Freshmen enrolled in remedial courses*		
	Total	Increased 10 percent or more	Stayed about the same	Decreased 10 percent or more	Reading	Writing	Math
	(Percentage distribution)				(Percent)		
All institutions	100	63	33	4	16	21	25
Control							
Public	100	70	26	5	18	22	27
Private	100	54	42	4	9	12	15
Type of institution							
2-year	100	69	27	5	19	23	28
4-year	100	58	38	4	12	17	19
Admission criteria							
Open	100	72	24	4	20	24	30
Liberal	100	57	39	4	14	17	18
Traditional	100	54	39	7	9	13	13
Selective	100	48	48	4	6	14	13
Region							
North Atlantic	100	62	36	2	15	20	19
Great Lakes and Plains	100	68	29	4	11	17	24
Southeast	100	54	38	8	20	23	31
West and Southwest	100	69	28	3	19	23	27
Size							
Less than 1,000	100	54	41	5	14	16	19
1,000 to 5,000	100	67	30	4	18	22	26
Greater than 5,000	100	66	29	5	16	21	25
Minority status							
Minority	100	48	41	11	38	39	45
Non-minority	100	64	32	4	15	20	24

* These percentages exclude students enrolled in pre-admission summer programs.

NOTE.--Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Table 3.--Students enrolled in remedial reading, writing, and math courses, and percent of freshman remedial course hours, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84

Institutional characteristic	Number of freshmen (in millions)	Percent of students				Percent of total freshman remedial course hours*
		Freshmen	Taking remedial reading	Taking remedial writing	Taking remedial math	
All institutions . . .	4.8	100	100	100	100	5.3
Control						
Public	4.1	85	92	91	91	5.8
Private.	.7	15	8	9	9	2.8
Type of institution						
2-year	3.0	63	73	70	71	6.1
4-year	1.8	37	27	30	29	4.2
Admission criteria						
Open	3.1	65	77	74	78	6.6
Liberal.	.7	16	13	13	12	4.2
Traditional.	.4	9	5	6	5	2.8
Selective.	.5	10	4	7	6	3.0
Region						
North Atlantic	1.1	23	23	21	17	5.8
Great Lakes and Plains . .	1.2	26	20	21	24	3.5
Southeast.	.9	20	27	22	25	7.2
West and Southwest	1.5	31	41	36	34	5.2
Size						
Less than 1,000.	.3	5	5	4	4	4.0
1,000 to 5,000	1.4	29	32	31	30	6.2
Greater than 5,000	3.1	65	63	65	66	5.0
Minority status						
Minority	.3	7	15	12	12	12.9
Non-minority	4.5	94	85	88	88	4.7

*Estimates based on sum of reported total number of hours taken in remedial reading, writing, and math as a percent of the total number of first-year, full-time equivalent (FTE) students multiplied by 30 hours (assumed FTE hours).

NOTE.--Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Table 4.--Institutions of higher education with remedial/development resources, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84

Institutional characteristic	Number with freshmen	Percent with remedial/developmental resources				
		Support services	Pre-admission summer programs	Department or division	Other academic courses[1]	Student development courses[2]
All institutions	2,785	90	24	33	21	58
Control						
Public	1,419	97	27	47	23	68
Private	1,366	82	20	18	17	44
Type of institution						
2-year	1,295	94	15	43	28	71
4-year	1,490	86	31	24	14	45
Admission criteria						
Open	1,258	99	21	46	26	70
Liberal	714	81	17	25	12	43
Traditional	354	93	34	23	16	58
Selective	459	78	34	19	20	40
Region						
North Atlantic	773	88	29	34	24	45
Great Lakes and Plains	730	92	16	29	25	57
Southeast	684	89	23	37	8	63
West and Southwest	599	92	27	31	25	69
Size						
Less than 1,000	849	83	8	22	16	45
1,000 to 5,000	1,212	92	25	35	17	65
Greater than 5,000	724	95	41	42	31	59
Minority status						
Minority	196	96	47	48	21	53
Non-minority	2,509	90	22	32	20	59

[1]Includes remedial courses in academic subjects other than reading, writing, or math (e.g., high school level science or social studies).

[2]Includes courses in such topics as career planning, decisionmaking, and some study skills.

Table 5a.--Percent of institutions with certain credit offerings and requirement status for remedial courses in reading, writing, and math, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

Course characteristic	Institutional characteristic								
	All institutions	Control		Type		Admission criteria			
		Public	Private	2-year	4-year	Open	Liberal	Traditional	Selective
Type of credit									
Reading									
No formal credit	18	13	27	19	16	17	11	14	42
Institutional credit	54	61	39	57	50	58	54	37	45
Degree credit elective	25	23	28	23	26	22	29	46	10
Degree credit subject	4	3	7	1	8	4	7	4	2
Writing									
No formal credit	16	13	22	12	20	12	5	22	44
Institutional credit	53	62	40	62	45	62	60	33	32
Degree credit elective	25	21	30	23	26	21	29	36	20
Degree credit subject	6	4	8	3	9	5	6	9	4
Math									
No formal credit	19	15	27	19	21	16	16	34	27
Institutional credit	52	60	38	57	45	57	57	26	43
Degree credit elective	23	20	28	20	27	21	24	31	25
Degree credit subject	6	5	8	4	8	7	3	9	5
Requirement status									
Reading									
Mandatory	51	46	61	45	59	46	71	47	46
Voluntary	49	54	39	55	41	54	29	53	54
Writing									
Mandatory	64	58	74	54	73	56	79	60	75
Voluntary	36	42	26	46	27	44	21	40	25
Math									
Mandatory	59	54	68	52	67	53	75	63	51
Voluntary	41	46	32	48	33	47	25	37	49

NOTE.--Percents may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 5b.--Percent of institutions with certain credit offerings and requirement status for remedial courses in reading, writing, and math, by size, region, and minority status: United States, 1983-84

Course characteristic	Size			Region				Minority status	
	Less than 1,000	1,000-5,000	Greater than 5,000	North Atlantic	Great Lakes and Plains	Southeast	West and Southwest	Minority	Non-minority
Type of credit									
Reading									
No formal credit	26	15	17	35	17	13	7	21	17
Institutional credit	48	58	52	35	56	61	61	60	53
Degree credit elective	19	24	28	23	25	22	29	10	26
Degree credit subject	7	4	3	8	3	4	3	9	4
Writing									
No formal credit	22	13	17	36	5	13	11	11	17
Institutional credit	50	55	55	29	59	65	61	69	52
Degree credit elective	22	26	25	25	30	18	26	9	26
Degree credit subject	6	7	4	10	5	4	3	11	5
Math									
No formal credit	32	13	19	35	19	15	9	12	20
Institutional credit	46	54	52	33	52	64	57	67	50
Degree credit elective	14	27	24	22	26	18	26	14	24
Degree credit subject	8	6	5	10	4	3	8	7	6
Requirement status									
Reading									
Mandatory	60	56	39	67	35	66	35	67	49
Voluntary	40	44	61	33	65	34	65	33	51
Writing									
Mandatory	71	67	54	78	53	68	56	64	64
Voluntary	29	33	46	22	47	32	44	36	36
Math									
Mandatory	68	64	46	77	47	66	47	65	59
Voluntary	33	36	54	23	53	34	53	35	41

NOTE.--Percents may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 6.--Percent of freshmen needing and enrolled in remedial reading, writing, or math courses, in schools having remedial courses, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1985-84

Institutional characteristic	Percent of students in schools having remedial courses reported as					
	Needing remedial courses in[1]			Enrolled in remedial courses in[2]		
	Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing	Math
All institutions	29	32	37	19	24	28
Control						
Public	30	33	38	19	24	29
Private	20	22	26	17	20	23
Type of institution						
2-year	32	35	41	20	25	30
4-year	23	26	30	16	21	25
Admission criteria						
Open	32	35	42	21	25	31
Liberal	22	25	26	19	22	24
Traditional	23	26	30	16	20	21
Selective	16	21	20	9	17	17
Region						
North Atlantic	22	27	28	18	24	23
Great Lakes and Plains	26	29	36	14	19	27
Southeast	31	31	41	23	26	34
West and Southwest	36	37	42	22	26	30
Size						
Less than 1,000	34	33	37	26	27	32
1,000 to 5,000	32	33	38	23	27	30
Greater than 5,000	28	31	37	17	22	27
Minority status						
Minority	50	51	54	39	42	48
Non-minority	28	30	36	18	22	27

[1]Percents are given for those schools having at least one remedial course in the subject area. Percents for schools having at least one remedial course in any subject are reported in the 1985 Condition of Education published by the Center for Statistics.

[2]These percentages differ from those in table 2 because only schools having courses are included. In table 2, schools not having courses are included as having "0" percent enrolled.

Table 7a.--Average ratings of remedial program aspects and services, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

Program aspect/service*	Institutional characteristic								
	All institutions	Control		Type		Admission criteria			
		Public	Private	2-year	4-year	Open	Liberal	Traditional	Selective
Course-related									
Teacher motivation/attitude. .	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.1
Teacher training/experience. .	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Curriculum content/structure .	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8
Breadth of offerings	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.0
Support services									
Training labs.	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.1	3.7
Tutoring	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7
Counseling	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.8	4.0	4.0
Support services	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7
Diagnosis.	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6
Organization and policy									
Placement policy	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.9	4.0	3.6
Program coordination	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.4
Program evaluation	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.0
Outcome for remedial students									
Remedial course completion . .	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.7	4.1	4.1
Overall program success. . . .	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7
Increased skill level.	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.7
Improved self-concept.	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8
Degree completion rate	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.6

* Respondents rated the effectiveness of their own activities on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = low, 5 = high).

Table 7b.--Average ratings of remedial program aspects and services, by region, size, and minority status: United States, 1983-84

Program aspect/service*	Institutional characteristic								
	Region				Size			Minority status	
	North Atlantic	Great Lakes and Plains	Southeast	West and Southwest	Less than 1,000	1,000 to 5,000	Greater than 5,000	Minority	Non-minority
Course-related									
Teacher motivation/attitude. .	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.2
Teacher training/experience. .	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0
Curriculum content/structure .	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.2	3.9
Breadth of offerings	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.9	3.4
Support services									
Training labs.	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.9
Tutoring	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8
Counseling	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.8
Support services	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
Diagnosis.	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	4.1	3.6
Organization and policy									
Placement policy	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7	4.2	3.8
Program coordination	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.8	3.6
Program evaluation	3.2	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.1
Outcome for remedial students									
Remedial course completion . .	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.8
Overall program success. . . .	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7
Increased skill level.	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6
Improved self-concept.	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6
Degree completion rate	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.2

*Respondents rated the effectiveness of their own activities on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = low, 5 = high).

Table 8.--Percent of students completing remedial courses, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84

Institutional characteristic	Percent of students completing remedial courses in			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Average for courses*
All institutions. .	74	71	68	71
Control				
Public.	73	70	67	70
Private	85	82	81	83
Type of institution				
2-year.	71	68	68	69
4-year.	80	77	69	75
Admission criteria				
Open.	71	68	67	69
Liberal	78	73	69	73
Traditional	87	83	75	82
Selective	85	83	76	81
Region				
North Atlantic. . . .	73	69	70	71
Great Lakes and Plains.	78	75	71	75
Southeast	75	69	66	70
West and Southwest. . .	71	70	66	69
Size				
Less than 1,000	80	72	74	75
1,000 to 5,000.	73	71	71	72
Greater than 5,000. . .	74	71	67	71
Minority status				
Minority.	63	58	58	60
Non-minority.	75	72	69	72

*Percent given is average for remedial reading, writing, and math courses.

Table 9.--Percent of schools keeping records of retention to the second year, and percent of all freshmen and freshmen taking one or more remedial courses retained to the second year, by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84

Institutional characteristic	Percent of schools keeping records of retention to second year for		Percent reported retained to second year			
			All freshmen		Freshmen taking one or more remedial courses	
	All freshmen	Freshmen taking one or more remedial courses	Schools keeping records	Schools not keeping records (estimates given)	Schools keeping records	Schools not keeping records (estimates given)
All institutions. .	63	35	64	57	60	52
Control						
Public.	50	28	62	56	58	51
Private	75	42	70	74	70	60
Type of institution						
2-year.	47	26	55	54	55	49
4-year.	76	43	71	66	66	60
Admission criteria						
Open.	44	23	56	54	55	49
Liberal	75	44	65	60	63	54
Traditional	77	44	70	72	64	64
Selective	81	47	79	83	76	72
Region						
North Atlantic.	67	41	68	62	68	53
Great Lakes and Plains.	65	32	62	54	56	52
Southeast	67	38	62	62	56	56
West and Southwest. . .	49	22	61	54	57	50
Size						
Less than 1,000	60	34	68	56	69	47
1,000 to 5,000.	67	35	58	55	55	50
Greater than 5,000. . .	57	32	66	57	62	53
Minority status						
Minority.	67	46	57	62	59	55
Non-minority.	62	33	64	56	60	52

Table 10.--Percent of freshmen taking one or more remedial courses and all freshmen retained to the second year, by remedial course status and by institutional characteristics: United States, 1983-84

Institutional characteristic	Retained to second year*			
	Freshmen taking one or more remedial classes	All freshmen		
		Schools having remedial courses	Schools not having remedial courses	All schools
All institutions	55	60	71	61
Control				
Public	53	58	66	59
Private	65	70	75	71
Type of institution				
2-year	50	55	60	55
4-year	63	69	76	70
Admission criteria				
Open	51	55	61	55
Liberal	57	64	66	64
Traditional	64	69	74	71
Selective	74	79	87	80
Region				
North Atlantic	61	65	77	66
Great Lakes and Plains	53	58	70	59
Southeast	56	62	72	62
West and Southwest	51	56	64	57
Size				
Less than 1,000	56	62	72	64
1,000 to 5,000	52	56	66	57
Greater than 5,000	56	61	76	62
Minority status				
Minority	57	59	60	59
Non-minority	55	60	71	61

*Respondents were asked to give estimated data if they did not keep records. Separate tabulations were made for respondents estimating and for schools keeping records. These are reported in table 9. Estimates and record data have been combined for this table.

APPENDIX I

Fast Response Survey System

The Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) was established in 1975 by the National Center for Education Statistics, now the Center for Statistics (CS), Office of Educational Research and Improvement. It was designed to collect small amounts of issue-oriented data quickly and with minimum burden on respondents.

Originally, FRSS was designed to collect data from the following educational sectors:

- State education agencies (SEA's);
- Local education agencies (LEA's);
- Public and private elementary and secondary schools;
- Institutions of higher education; and
- Noncollegiate postsecondary schools with occupational programs.

In recent years, the scope of FRSS has expanded to include other educational populations, such as public libraries and adult literacy programs.

All 50 States and the District of Columbia are included in the SEA sector. For each of the other sectors, a stratified random sample was designed to allow valid national estimates to be made. The sample sizes range from 500 to 1,000.

A data collection network involving both respondents and coordinators was developed in sectors that are surveyed frequently, such as LEA's. Coordinators assist in the data collection by maintaining liaison with the sampled institutions or agencies. The respondents, selected to report for their institutions or agencies, voluntarily provide the policy-oriented data requested in the questionnaires.

The Fast Response Survey System provides CS with a mechanism for furnishing data quickly and efficiently. All aspects of the system--the sample design, the network of coordinators and respondents, and the short questionnaires--have been designed with this in mind.

Methodology for the Survey of Remedial/Developmental Studies in Institutions of Higher Education

A national sample of 511 colleges and universities was drawn from the universe of 3,238 colleges and universities in the Higher Education General Information System (HEGIS XVII) Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education of 1982. The universe file was stratified by enrollment size and control, then sorted by type and region. This procedure was followed for colleges with predominately non-minority enrollment. Because of the small number of minority schools, they were simply sorted by the four variables (size, control, type, and region). The sample was selected with probability proportional to the square root of enrollment size. The questionnaire was mailed in August 1984; data collection and telephone followup continued until the end of October. The survey was addressed to the president of the institution with the request that it be completed by the person designated most knowledgeable about remedial/developmental programs. An overall response rate of 96 percent was obtained. Of the total sample, 27 colleges were determined to be out of scope because they did not have freshmen and 2 were closed. The weighted total of colleges from the sample is thus 2,785, somewhat lower than the universe file of 3,238.

The response data were weighted to produce national estimates and a weight adjustment was made to account for survey nonresponse. The weights were calculated for each school inversely proportional to its square root of size. These weights ranged from 1 to 40.73. A balanced half-sample replication method was used to compute sampling errors of the statistics.

Standard Errors of Statistics

The findings in this report are estimates based on the FRSS sample of colleges and universities and consequently are subject to sampling variability. If the questionnaire had been sent to a different sample, the responses would not have been identical; some numbers might have been higher, while others might have been lower. The estimated standard error of a statistic (a measure of the variation due to sampling) can be used to examine the precision obtained in a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.645 standard errors below to 1.645 standard errors above a particular statistic would include the average result of these samples in approximately 90 percent of the cases. For example, for the percent of institutions having remedial writing courses (see table), a 90 percent confidence interval is from 69.9 to 76.1 (73.0 $\pm$ 1.645 times 1.7). If this procedure were followed for every possible sample, about 90 percent of the intervals would include the average from all possible samples.

The following table presents the standard errors for selected questionnaire items. Specific statements of comparison in the text are significant at the 90 percent confidence level or better. Standard errors for other questionnaire items and statistics in this report, not included in the table, can be obtained on request.

Table--Standard errors of selected items

Item	Estimate	Standard error
Percent of institutions having:		
Remedial writing course, all institutions	73.0	1.7
Remedial math course, schools with student enrollment over 5,000	86.5	2.6
Remedial math course, private institutions	53.1	2.6
Remedial reading course, minority institutions	91.1	4.6
Average number of courses offered in remedial writing by private institutions	1.3	.04
Percent of institutions in which remedial enrollment:		
Remained the same, public institutions	25.7	1.6
Increased 10 percent or more, minority institutions	48.1	6.1
Percent of freshmen enrolled in:		
Remedial reading course, all institutions	16.4	1.2
Remedial writing course, 2-year institutions	23.2	.9
Remedial math course, North Atlantic region	29.5	1.2
Remedial writing course, traditional admission institutions	12.8	4.5
Remedial math course, schools with student enrollment less than 1,000	18.8	.9
Percent of institutions having:		
Remedial pre-admission summer program, traditional admission institutions	34.4	3.2
Remedial department or division, all institutions	32.9	2.3
Remedial courses in academic subjects other than reading, writing or math, all institutions	20.5	2.3
Student development courses, Great Lakes and Plains region	57.4	6.2
Percent of institutions awarding:		
Institutional credit for remedial writing, all institutions	53.5	2.2
Elective or subject degree credit for remedial math, minority institutions	20.7	3.2
Percent of institutions in which courses are mandatory for:		
Remedial writing, all institutions	64.0	2.9
Remedial reading, liberal admission institutions	70.5	5.1
Remedial math, Southeast region	66.3	4.2
Average rating on a scale of 1 to 5:		
Remedial curriculum, all institutions	4.0	.04
Overall remedial program success, all institutions	3.7	.03
Remedial course completion, 4-year institutions	3.9	.05
Percent of students completing:		
Remedial writing course, all institutions	71.0	.5
Remedial math course, all institutions	68.3	1.5
Average percent of schools keeping records on freshmen taking one or more remedial courses in private institutions	41.6	3.2
Percent of total freshmen retained to second year:		
Public schools keeping records	61.5	1.2
Public schools not keeping records	55.6	.6

APPENDIX II

FAST RESPONSE SURVEY SYSTEM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

Form approved
OMB No. 1850-0550
App. Exp. 10/84

SURVEY OF REMEDIAL/DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This report is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

Definition of Remedial/Developmental Studies for Purposes of this Study: Program, course, or other activity (usually in the area of reading, writing, or math) for students lacking those skills necessary to perform college level work at the level required by your institution. Throughout this questionnaire these activities are referred to as "remedial/developmental;" however, your institution may use other names such as "compensatory," "basic skills," or some other term. Please answer the survey for any activities meeting the definition above, regardless of name; however, do not include English as a second language when taught primarily to foreign students.

Please answer for your regular undergraduate programs. If exact data are not available, give your best estimate.

1. Check which of the following remedial/developmental activities/structures are present at your institution.

   A. Special pre-admission/enrollment summer program (e.g., Upward Bound, etc.) |___|
   B. Academic year and/or summer course(s) |___|
   C. Support activities (e.g., counseling, tutoring) |___|
   D. Remedial department or division |___|

   If your institution has no courses, support activities, or summer programs, skip to Question 7; if you have support activities only, skip to Question 5.

2. Enter information requested in Parts A-G for remedial/developmental courses in each subject area listed for academic year 1983-4, including summer courses. For those subjects in which you have no remedial courses, enter "0" in Part A and answer only Part E.

Remedial course information	Reading	Writing	Math
A. Number of separate courses (Do not count courses repeated in more than one semester or multiple sections of the same course more than once).			
B. Most frequent type of credit (enter one): 1=No formal credit; 2=Institutional credit, does not meet subject or graduation requirements; 3=Degree credit, elective only; 4=Degree credit, meets subject requirements.			
C. Most frequent type of requirement status (enter one): 1=Mandatory; 2=Voluntary			
D. Approximate total remedial/developmental undergraduate course hours in subject in 1983-4 (e.g., 30 students take a 3 hour course and 20 take a 2 hour course = 130 hours remedial math).			
E. Estimated percent of entering freshmen needing one or more remedial courses.			
F. Estimated percent of entering freshmen who enrolled in one or more remedial courses (Give unduplicated count of students within each subject).			
G. Average percent of students passing or successfully completing the remedial course(s).			

3. About what percent of entering freshmen participate in a special pre-admission/enrollment summer program (e.g., Upward Bound, etc.)? _____%.

4. Overall, has remedial course enrollment since 1978: Increased |__|; Decreased |__|; Stayed about the same |__|? If enrollment has increased or decreased, indicate approximate percent of change: 10 to 30 percent |__|; 31 to 50 percent |__|; 51 percent or more |__|.

5. On a scale of 1-5 (1=low, 5=high), rate the success or effectiveness of each of the following aspects/services of your remedial/developmental program. If you do not have a given service, enter "N" for "Not Provided"

A. Remedial Course Related	Rating	C. Remedial Organization/Policy	Rating
1. Breadth of offerings		1. Placement policy appropriate to student needs	
2. Curriculum content/structure		2. Coordination of remedial programs	
3. Teacher/training experience		3. Program evaluation/follow-up	
4. Teacher motivation/attitude			
B. Remedial Support Services	**Rating**	**D. Outcome for Remedial Students**	**Rating**
1. Diagnosis		1. Skill level increase	
2. Counseling		2. Self concept improvement	
3. Tutoring		3. Remedial course completion rate	
4. Learning assistance labs (e.g., reading or writing labs)		4. Degree/certificate completion rate	
5. Overall support services		5. Overall program success	

6. In addition to those courses listed in Question 2, does your institution offer remedial/developmental courses in:

   A. Academic subjects other than basic skills (e.g., science, business)? Yes |___|; No |___|. If yes, number of these courses offered in 1983-4 _____.
   B. Student development (e.g., human potential, career planning)? Yes |___|; No |___|. If yes, number of these courses offered in 1983-4 _____.

7. Indicate whether records have been kept by your institution over the last 2 to 3 years for the items listed. If yes, enter information; if no, please give your best estimate.

   A. Average percent of entering freshmen retained by start of second year: Records kept: Yes |___| No |___|; Percent retained _____%.
   B. Average percent of entering freshmen who have taken one or more remedial courses retained by start of second year: Records kept: Yes |___| No |___|; Percent retained _____%. Enter "N" if you have no remedial courses.)

Person completing this form: Name_____ Title_____

Institution_____ State_____ Phone(_____)_____

NCES Form No. 2179-20, 9/84

BEST COPY AVAILABLE